



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/878,327

06/12/2001

Rui Zhou

839-1013

2117

30024

7590

01/26/2006

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

EXAMINER

REILLY, SEAN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/878,327	Applicant(s) ZHOU ET AL.	
	Examiner Sean Reilly	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u>1/17/06</u> |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This application has been assigned to another Examiner.

This office action is in response to Applicant's request for reconsideration filed October 21, 2005. Claims 1-21 are presented for further examination. Claims 1-18 are unchanged and claims 19-21 are new. Due to the new grounds of rejection this action is made **NON-FINAL**.

Priority

1. No claim for priority was made.
2. The effective filing date for the subject matter defined in the pending claims in this application is 6/12/2001.

37 CFR § 1.105 – Request for Information

3. Applicant and the assignee of this application are required under 37 CFR § 1.105 to provide the following information that the examiner has determined is reasonably necessary to the examination of this application. The information is required to complete the background description in the disclosure by documenting the eMatrix 9 product from MatrixOne Inc as described in ¶ 04 of Applicant's specification.

In response to this requirement, please provide copies of the following:

- A) Any manuals or other relevant eMatrix 9 product literature that discusses identifying users through a "person" (as Applicant discusses in the background portion of the specification ¶ 04).

Art Unit: 2153

4. The fee and certification requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97 are waived for those documents submitted in reply to this requirement. This waiver extends only to those documents within the scope of this requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.105 that are included in the applicant's first complete communication responding to this requirement. Any supplemental replies subsequent to the first communication responding to this requirement and any information disclosures beyond the scope of this requirement under 37 C.F.R. § 1.105 are subject to the fee and certification requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.97.
5. The applicant is reminded that the reply to this requirement must be made with candor and good faith under 37 CFR 1.56. Where the applicant does not have or cannot readily obtain an item of required information, a statement that the item is unknown or cannot be readily obtained will be accepted as a complete response to the requirement for that item.
6. This requirement is an attachment of the enclosed Office action. A complete response to the enclosed Office action must include a complete response to this requirement. The time period for reply to this requirement coincides with the time period for reply to the enclosed Office action, which is 3 months.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. **Claims 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.**

Art Unit: 2153

8. With regard to claim 13, the term “and” in the limitation “and creating *and* LDAP user account entry” renders the claim indefinite. It is presumed that the claim was intended to recite “and creating *an* LDAP user account entry.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12-14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kennedy (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0162028).

In considering claim 1, Kennedy disclosed a collaboration control system for managing use of a plurality of resources, comprising:

A user information collection routine for collecting user account information for a user using the resources and creating an LDAP user account entry (creating a user account in the master directory structure, ¶s 31 and 32; for the LDAP protocol refer to ¶ 35); and

A mirror routine for automatically generating mirror persons from the LDAP user account entry and maintaining the mirror persons within the resources to identify the user across

Art Unit: 2153

the resources (replicating the master user account directory structure to the remote data centers 108, 110, and 112 of Figure 1, see ¶ 23).

In considering claim 2, Kennedy further discloses that the user information comprises a user name and password (users enters username and password information, ¶ 35).

In considering claim 4, Kennedy further discloses a profile management routine for updating the information in the user account entry (all changes to users accounts are disseminated across the remote data centers, see inter alia ¶s 10 and 23-24).

In considering claim 6, Kennedy further discloses that the resources are Internet-accessible (e.g. web page access over the Internet, ¶ 02).

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 describe a method for performing the same steps as respective claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 13 and 14 describe a computer-readable medium for performing the same steps as respective claims 1 and 4 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

In considering claims 16-18, Kennedy disclosed the user is identified within each resource by the same username and password (¶ 11).

Art Unit: 2153

In considering claims 19-20, Kennedy disclosed the mirror person within a particular one of the plurality of resources determines the user's right to access that resource (e.g. each data center provides local user authentication, ¶ 35).

In considering claim 21, Kennedy disclosed the mirror routine generates the mirror persons when the user account entry is created (all changes to master directory structure are disseminated across the remote data centers, see inter alia ¶s 10 and 23-24).

10. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12-14, and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Child et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,801,946; hereinafter Child).

In considering claim 1, Child disclosed a collaboration control system for managing use of a plurality of resources, comprising:

A user information collection routine for collecting user account information for a user using the resources and creating an LDAP user account entry (when the LDAP GSO schema is utilized associated ePerson, eGSOuser, and eTargetRecord objects are created for each user of the system, see inter alia Figure 2.1, Col 1, lines 55-62, Col 4, lines 26-30, 47-50 and Col 12, lines 16-28); and

A mirror routine for automatically generating mirror persons from the LDAP user account entry and maintaining the mirror persons within the resources to identify the user across the resources (logging the user into other resources based on the eTargetRecords associated with the user as described in detail in Col 10, line 53 – Col 11, line 58).

In considering claim 2, Child further discloses that the user information comprises a user name and password (i.e. login information, see ePerson, Figure 2.1).

In considering claim 4, Child further discloses a profile management routine for updating the information in the user account entry (e.g. updating/creating eTargetRecords and other associated GSO account, Col 4, lines 47-53).

In considering claim 6, Child further discloses that the resources are Internet-accessible (e.g. an FTP server associable over the Internet, Col 7, lines 38-50).

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 describe a method for performing the same steps as respective claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 13 and 14 describe a computer-readable medium for performing the same steps as respective claims 1 and 4 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

In considering claims 19-20, Child disclosed the mirror person within a particular one of the plurality of resources determines the user's right to access that resource (i.e. in Child's system the user is separately logged into each domain or resource because each resource handles it's own system access rights separate of any other domain or resource the user may be logged into).

In considering claim 21, Child disclosed the mirror routine generates the mirror persons when the user account entry is created (e.g. logging in eTargetRecord objects set to auto initiated, Col 11, lines 7-12).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10, 12-14, and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutcher et al. (U.S. Patent Number 6,269,405; hereinafter Dutcher) and Gullotta et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication Number 2002/0156904; hereinafter Gullotta).

In considering claim 1, Dutcher disclosed a collaboration control system for managing use of a plurality of resources, comprising:

A user information collection routine for collecting user account information for a user using the resources and creating an user account entry (creation of accounts at the central server, see Figure 5 and Col 6, lines 14-20); and

A mirror routine for automatically generating mirror persons from the user account entry and maintaining the mirror persons within the resources to identify the user across the resources

Art Unit: 2153

(replicating user accounts across managed servers, see Figure 5 and Col 6, lines 14-20 and 56-59).

Dutcher disclosed substantial features of the claimed invention however, Dutcher failed to specifically recite that the user account entry is an LDAP user account entry. Nonetheless the use of the LDAP protocol for maintaining user accounts was widely known in the art at the time of the invention, as evidenced by Gullotta. In an analogous user access control system Gullotta disclosed using an LDAP database for the storage of user accounts (see inter alia, ¶s 39-40). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the use of LDAP user accounts as disclosed by Gullotta within Dutcher's system, since the LDAP protocol defines a uniform directory structure for the storage of user accounts and would thus provide easier interoperability with application interfaces for user authentication.

In considering claim 2, Gullotta further discloses that the user information comprises a user name and password (Gullotta, ¶ 64).

In considering claim 4, Dutcher further discloses a profile management routine for updating the information in the user account entry (Dutcher - replicating user updates account across managed servers, see Figure 5 and Col 6, lines 14-20).

In considering claim 6, Gullotta further discloses that the resources are Internet-accessible (e.g. web page access over the Internet, ¶ 17).

Art Unit: 2153

Claims 7, 8, 10, and 12 describe a method for performing the same steps as respective claims 1, 2, 4, and 6 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 13 and 14 describe a computer-readable medium for performing the same steps as respective claims 1 and 4 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

In considering claims 16-18, Dutcher disclosed the user is identified within each resource by the same username and password (Col 6, lines 56-59).

In considering claims 19-20, Dutcher disclosed the mirror person within a particular one of the plurality of resources determines the user's right to access that resource (e.g. in Dutcher's system each managed server (see figure 5) authenticates the user access locally).

In considering claim 21, Dutcher disclosed the mirror routine generates the mirror persons when the user account entry is created (e.g. "synchronized user accounts are commonly created, updated, and deleted", see Col 6, lines 14-20 and 56-59).

12. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutcher and Gullotta, in view of Win et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353, hereinafter "Win").

In considering claim 3 and 9, Dutcher and Gullotta remain silent regarding what type of resources are being accessed and therefore does not disclose that the resources comprise databases. Nonetheless, it is well known to use single sign on systems to provide access to

Art Unit: 2153

database resources, as evidenced by Win. In a similar art, Win discloses a single sign on system for providing clients access to resources (Abstract), wherein the resources comprise databases (col. 5, lines 19-20, "examples of resources include... a Web-enabled database"). Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to use the Dutcher and Gullotta authentication system for the database resources taught by Win because databases often include confidential information and thus should not be accessed without proper authentication.

13. Claims 5, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dutcher and Gullotta, in view of what is well known in the art.

In considering claims 5, 11, and 15, although the system taught by Dutcher and Gullotta discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it does not disclose steps for sending an electronic mail message to the user, wherein the electronic mail message contains a user password. Nonetheless, Examiner takes Official notice that such a feature in secure online systems is well known (i.e. it is well known for systems that provide authenticated access to information, such as e-mail systems, to include a feature of e-mailing the user's password to the user in case the user forgets his or her password). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include such a feature in the system taught by Dutcher and Gullotta, so that if a user forgets his or her password, he or she can find out what it is in order to access the user's account.

14. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy, in view of Win et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353, hereinafter "Win").

In considering claim 3 and 9, Kennedy remains silent regarding what type of resources are being accessed and therefore does not disclose that the resources comprise databases. Nonetheless, it is well known to use single sign on systems to provide access to database resources, as evidenced by Win. In a similar art, Win discloses a single sign on system for providing clients access to resources (Abstract), wherein the resources comprise databases (col. 5, lines 19-20, "examples of resources include... a Web-enabled database"). Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to use the Kennedy authentication system for the database resources taught by Win because databases often include confidential information and thus should not be accessed without proper authentication.

15. Claims 3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Child, in view of Win et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353, hereinafter "Win").

In considering claim 3 and 9, Child remains silent regarding what type of resources are being accessed and therefore does not disclose that the resources comprise databases. Nonetheless, it is well known to use single sign on systems to provide access to database resources, as evidenced by Win. In a similar art, Win discloses a single sign on system for providing clients access to resources (Abstract), wherein the resources comprise databases (col. 5, lines 19-20, "examples of resources include... a Web-enabled database"). Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to use the Child authentication system for the database resources taught by Win because databases often include confidential information and thus should not be accessed without proper authentication.

Art Unit: 2153

16. Claims 5, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kennedy, in view of what is well known in the art.

In considering claims 5, 11, and 15, although the system taught by Kennedy discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it does not disclose steps for sending an electronic mail message to the user, wherein the electronic mail message contains a user password.

Nonetheless, Examiner takes Official notice that such a feature in secure online systems is well known (i.e. it is well known for systems that provide authenticated access to information, such as e-mail systems, to include a feature of e-mailing the user's password to the user in case the user forgets his or her password). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include such a feature in the system taught by Kennedy, so that if a user forgets his or her password, he or she can find out what it is in order to access the user's account.

17. Claims 5, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Child, in view of what is well known in the art.

In considering claims 5, 11, and 15, although the system taught by Child discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it does not disclose steps for sending an electronic mail message to the user, wherein the electronic mail message contains a user password.

Nonetheless, Examiner takes Official notice that such a feature in secure online systems is well known (i.e. it is well known for systems that provide authenticated access to information, such as e-mail systems, to include a feature of e-mailing the user's password to the user in case the user forgets his or her password). Therefore, it would have been obvious to include such a feature in

Art Unit: 2153

the system taught by Child, so that if a user forgets his or her password, he or she can find out what it is in order to access the user's account.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

18. This office action is made **NON-FINAL**.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean Reilly whose telephone number is 571-272-4228. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

January 17, 2006


JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER